URBANIZATION IN THE SOUTH: A CRITIQUE AND ANALYSIS

Editors: David R. Colburn
George E. Pozzetta
Richard K. Scher

With the assistance of the Urban and Regional
Development Center, University of Florida.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
PREFACE		i
I.	INTRODUCTION TO PROCEEDINGS	1
II.	"Urbanization in the South" by Professor Carl Feiss	8
III.	"Immigrant, Settler, or Ethnic: Profiling Florida's Population" by Dr. Robert Heighton, Jr.	15
IV.	"Urban, Industrial and Agricultural Interrelationships in the Florida Economy" by Dr. B. R. Eddleman	32
V.	"Problems Faced by an Emerging Southern City" by Richard Jones	44
VI.	"Balance in Urban Growth" by Herman Goldner	48
VII.	"The Urbanization of Southern Politics"	53
VIII.	URBAN WORKSHOPS	
	Politics in an Urbanizing South	63
	Environment and Energy	68
	Economics	72
	Population and Human Resources	78
IX.	CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS	82

PREFACE

The Urban and Regional Development Center is happy to reprint the papers delivered at the successful Symposium on Urbanization in the South, held on Friday, April 6, 1973 in the Reitz Union of the University of Florida. This first symposium on the subject, with the exception of two invited outside speakers, was an all campus project, originated and directed by the three competent co-chairmen, Professors Colburn, Pozzetta and Scher who also edited the papers. The URDC is always eager to assist projects of this kind, not only to encourage individual and group interest in the vital questions of our urbanizing world, but also to help add to our knowledge of a complex and confusing subject.

We believe that the prepared papers, reprinted here, are worth careful study and that they will be used frequently as the basis for further research and more meetings of concerned people. We regret that we cannot publish the lively discussions.

We are inquiring into the future of man in a badly damaged world. While nature itself can be ruthless, man's destructive forces have added immeasurably to the threats to his own survival. It is the role of a great university to teach the facts as they are identified and to stimulate thoughtful action.

Carl Feiss
Director
URDC

INTRODUCTION

Proceedings of the Symposium on Southern Urbanization

On April 6, 1973, a Symposium on Urbanization in the South was held at the University of Florida with the assistance of the Urban and Regional Development Center of the University. The conference was envisioned by the three co-chairmen as an opportunity to bring together students and faculty from the University and members of the Gainesville-Alachua County community to discuss informally the implications urbanization has for the South. The purpose of the meeting was not to devise a systematic program to solve the problems of an urbanizing world. In fact, no concrete solutions were expected to emerge from the day's events. The Symposium was seen, instead, as a chance for interested persons to begin thinking about, discussing, and formulating courses of action which the South might employ if it is to cope successfully with the processes of urbanization already actively underway.

The Symposium on Urbanization in the South was the first ever held at the University of Florida. Because of the time involved in preparing such a meeting and because it was the first such gathering, the Symposium focused principally on urbanization in Florida and Gainesville, Florida in particular. This state and city were selected because of their accessibility and the phenomenal growth that each is experiencing. However, the problems and possibilities of urbanization in these areas have counterparts throughout the South.

Future Symposia will probably be two days in length and will focus on such general issues as a history of Southern urbanization, regional

planning, metropolitanism and regionalism, ecology and urbanization, and mobilization and the utilization of human resources in an urban area. Other conferences might also include intensive analysis of specific urban and metropolitan problems, such as employment, welfare services, housing, minority problems and education.

For this Symposium, a series of formal papers, panel discussions and workshops were devised. The speeches and panel discussions were designed to lead into four workshops treating the following topics: Population and Human Resources; Environment and Energy; Economic Development; and Politics in an Urbanized South. The workshops were conducted in an informal, roundtable manner. It was felt that this approach encouraged maximum participation and interaction among the workshop members. The function of workshops was twofold. They were to provide a mechanism for interested faculty, members of the community, and student body to establish working relationships in these areas of public concern. And they were to begin efforts to establish definitions of problems, define agendas, and seek frameworks for exploring policy issues inherent in urbanization.

Until very recently urbanization has been an issue of little concern to the South. Despite the existence of cities which have had histories of two hundred years or more, urban problems have been either ignored or dealt with meagerly by Southern officialdom. For the most part agriculture and a rural life style have determined the structure and direction of Southern society. Up until World War II, the vast majority of the region's population resided in a rural setting (Census figures disclosed that 85% of the South's population was engaged in

agriculture prior to the Civil War with the percentage gradually declining to 51% in 1943). Since World War II the South has received a sudden and dramatic push into the urban world of the twentieth century. Today 65% of the region's population and 80.5% of Florida's population live in an urban environment. Yet, the South has been very slow to modify its political and social institutions to deal with the complexities of urbanization.

In his speech on "Urbanization in the South," Professor Carl Feiss, Director of the Urban and Regional Development Center at the University of Florida and noted architect and urban planner, pointed out that there is no state or regional growth policy in the South. Yet, the population expansion in the sun-belt region of the country, which stretches from the Mexican border to the Atlantic Ocean, has been growing at a faster pace in the last five years than it did in the preceeding twenty years. Feiss warned that unless the South in general and Florida in particular take steps to establish sound growth policies, they would sink in their own "putrid wastes." "Urbanization simply cannot be allowed to develop unregulated," Feiss stated, "or the South would be confronted with the same urban deterioration that has occurred in the Northeast."

Many observers believe that such planning is also necessary to preserve certain aspects of the region's cultural and ethnic diversity. In a speech entitled "Immigrant, Settler or Ethnic: Profiling Florida's Population," Dr. Robert Heighton, Jr.* of the University of Florida's

---

*Dr. Otto von Mering was originally scheduled to deliver this address but a death in his family prevented him from doing so. Dr. Heighton, a colleague of Dr. von Mering, graciously consented to complete Dr. von Mering's paper and make the presentation.

Department of Anthropology declared that Florida's unique ethnic composition is being destroyed by rapid, unregulated growth. Immigrants and ethnic groups, he said, are being shaped into a homogeneous mass "of undifferentiated people" by urbanization. Heighton viewed this as an alarming development because these ethnic groups, particularly the Czechs, Swedes and Cubans, have had a profound effect on the state's economic growth and cultural vitality.

Despite the present lack of a comprehensive urban growth policy, there have been steps taken in several Southern states to cope with certain aspects of growth. In Florida, for example, economists have designed systems which measure quite accurately the urban, industrial and agricultural interrelationships in the state's economy. Professor Bob Eddleman of the University of Florida's Food and Resource Economics Department noted in an analysis of these interrelationships that economists have gathered sufficient statistical data to determine with some accuracy the impact of growth and increased spending on Florida's economic development. Eddleman also indicated that economic projections are becoming so sophisticated that it is possible to project how much electricity, water and agricultural land the state will need if its population should double or triple in size.

The economic approach to growth referred to by Dr. Eddleman has gained uniform acceptance by economists because of its scientific validity. However, specialists in urban government, lacking methodological and conceptual tools, are presently divided on what political approach will provide the sanest growth policy. These opposing views were expressed at the Symposium by Mayor Richard Jones of Gainesville, and

Mayor Herman Goldner of St. Petersburg.

Mayor Jones argued that city governments have to be allowed to determine their own needs and to have the authority to deal with them accordingly. Cities in Florida have failed to cope with urbanization, Jones said, because state legislators, through their general ignorance of urban affairs, have been unwilling to grant cities the necessary power and authority. Legislators who are from rural or suburban areas of Florida have seldom experienced urban problems first hand. The extent of their knowledge, the Mayor declared, has been confined to a ride through a ghetto or a shopping tour downtown. Jones pointed out that cities alone understand their problems thoroughly, and they have to be given the power to deal effectively with them, preferably through home rule.

Herman Goldner, Mayor of St. Petersburg and a member of the executive board of the United States Conferences of Mayors, vigorously debated Mayor Jones' contention. Goldner declared that fresh, new structures of government are needed to eliminate the problems of urban growth. The structures, he said, should be of sufficient size so that planning can be more effective. He used the problem of pollution in Tampa Bay to point out the failures of the traditional systems of government. In the 1960's St. Petersburg adopted a comprehensive system of waste disposal to eliminate water pollution in the Bay. The neighboring city of Tampa, however, continued its old waste disposal system and thus continued to pollute the Bay. The result was that St. Petersburg failed to benefit at all from its actions. Goldner stressed that only a regional system of government can design programs of sufficient breadth to achieve a total environmental balance.

While Mayor Jones and Mayor Goldner debated the political action the South should take to alleviate the problems of unregulated growth, Dr. Manning Dauer of the University of Florida's Political Science Department noted that urbanization has already effected significantly the politics of the South. Dauer maintained that the South is becoming less tradition-bound through urbanization and is rapidly emerging through a new leadership in the business, professional, and political realms. A new breed of both Southern Republicans and Democrats has developed, he said, along with a sharp rise in black office holders. These new political figures are essentially urban in outlook and energetically support industrialization of the South but no longer at the expense of the black. Dauer sees a continued break with traditional Southern political patterns as the region becomes increasingly urbanized.

Dauer's remarks concluded the formal papers at the Symposium and set the stage for the workshops. Brief abstracts of the workshops' proceedings are included to illustrate the range of issues facing an urbanized South.

Members of the Environment and Energy Workshop agreed that elements within the state have to take some positive steps to curtail unlimited and unregulated power consumption. One of their recommendations was that state and city governments explore ways to reward or at the very least require reduced power outlays by the use of new building codes and zoning laws. Participants in the Population and Human Resources panel focused on the problems caused by Florida's massive annual in-migration. They urged that growth in cities be limited, by law if necessary. The goal of state policy, in their view, should be to provide a healthy

existence for all its citizens before it encouraged the immigration of others.

The Economic Workshop was acutely aware of the state's pressing environmental needs. It recommended that cities and towns discourage the location of industries that would be harmful to the environment. Additionally it suggested that steps be taken to preserve agricultural land in the state before it is entirely in the hands of developers. Members of the workshop on Politics in an Urbanized South felt that urbanization might very well benefit the region. They argued that urban development has facilitated the emergence of the two party system and has enabled blacks to take a meaningful part in the political process.

The co-chairmen would like to thank all those who participated in the day's proceedings. In particular we would like to thank Carl Feiss of the Urban and Regional Development Center for his encouragement and financial assistance. Special appreciation must also be extended to each speaker and workshop chairman: Dr. Bob Eddleman, Dr. Robert Heighton, Jr., Dr. Otto von Mering, Professor Carl Feiss, Mr. Herman Goldner, Mr. Richard Jones, Dr. Manning Dauer, Mrs. Roberta Malavenda, Dr. Walter Rosenbaum, Mrs. Phyllis Bleiweiss, and Dr. Augustus Burns. Finally, we would like to extend our appreciation to our secretary Mrs. Adrienne Turner.

URBANIZATION IN THE SOUTH

Carl Feiss, F.A.I.A., A.I.P.
Director, Urban and Regional Development Center
Professor of Architecture and Urban Studies
University of Florida

Growth means many things to many people. We are considering today the impact of growth of many kinds in the sun-belt, particularly in the Southeast and specifically in Florida. I am aiming my remarks at the growth of responsibility on the part of citizens and public officials as other kinds of growth impact us in this region and the state.

This one day conference generated by a group of interested faculty on this campus is the first of many similar meetings which will be held at the University of Florida and elsewhere in this state for many years to come. Every person in this room, every person on this campus, in this community, the state and the region and elsewhere in the United States is living in a rapidly expanding urban world. This expansion is growing at a phenomenal rate, seldom exceeded within my knowledge. We in the sun-belt, which stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific and across the central portion of the United States south to the Gulf and the Mexican border, are subject to or are part of one of these mass-migrations which has occurred from time to time in history for a wide variety of reasons in many portions of the globe. This particular migration is as yet little researched and therefore, little understood. We are too close to it to see it and all its ramifications, although we are sensing its impact already, and we are beginning to predict some of its outcomes. We cannot anticipate its magnitude, its component parts or its duration. The word

"growth", when associated with this migration, is applied not only to the four major elements of this afternoon's workshop: Population and Human Resources, Environment and Energy, Economic Development, and Politics in the Urban South; but it relates to all of the ponderous mechanisms of government management, the obsolete and inadequate physical infra-structure which must support the growth changes occurring today and projected into the indefinite future. We must, per force, also house this growth change in obsolete old settlements and obsolete patterns of new settlements while constantly pressured by high powered sales programs, conceived not just in our state but nationally and internationally. Growth is being stimulated and promoted from without the state and vast extraterritorial decisions are being made by giant out-of-state corporations whose decisions and promotions will permanently change the character of the state. These changes are being made without our direction, control, and relationship to national or state development policy and plans. We are a giant grab-bag. The hands reaching into us are being filled with our native gold with only a small part of it slipping back to us from these heavily laden fists.

This new colonialism to which we are being subjected is, however, only a small part of our problem since our own land boom generated by our own people is under no better control. The growth that we anticipate is not only in increments in population, but it is the growth of lots, real estate plats and plots, countless square miles of committed land in every county of unknown quality and quantity. It is large and small development within cities and in the wilderness and in every place in and between, selected to entice and induce more people to bring with them more auto-

mobiles, more demands for energy, for water, for waste disposal, for medical care, for education, for food, for employment, for welfare, for housing, for human companionship, for fun in the sun, and everything else and anything else that can be considered.

Let me point out that while all of this is happening as part of the growth of our particular portion of the Southeast, something else has happened which places us in a most peculiar set of new circumstances. These relate to our ability to meet the issues we are currently facing and will be facing as our state's population doubles between now and the year 2000. It must be remembered that in all probability natural growth will remain a relatively small percentage of our total growth. I would conjecture that even were the natural growth rate of the entire population of the United States to fall off substantially over the next 10 years, this would have little impact on our rate of growth in Florida over the next 25 or 30 years.

Therefore, as an immigrant reception center, the state as a whole must deal with giant old and new management responsibilities for some of which we know no precedent. The management problems which we face fall into many categories. First, there are great portions of our state which are rural in nature, with a small population and a small income. Those who run these areas are inexperienced and incompetent to handle instant new communities, planned or unplanned, large or small. They have had no experience in municipal management or county management dealing with the issues of urbanization. They have no front money with which they can gear themselves up to undertake new responsibilities. They are unable to judge the quality or impact of what is happening to them, and they

have no place to go for help even if they knew that help were needed. They are instantly and permanently exploited. Here is one giant area in which the growth responsibility must be faced by someone. To the best of my knowledge, little attention is being given to this most serious problem. All we have to do is look at a half dozen counties which have been and are being impacted by an unexpected and unprecedented urbanization. They were predominantly rural 5 to 10 years ago. The staggering problems which have been created in these places highlights a kind of built-in innocence which appears to be irresponsibility but is probably a combination of ignorance, venality, opportunism and just plain irresponsibility. Equally important and of equally great concern is what is happening to the major centers of urbanization. These centers are usually of greater sophistication in government management although not necessarily any more sophisticated than their 18th century laws, rules, and regulations would permit. Besides the pressures of population growth they face the sudden withdrawal of federal aid in areas in which such aid has normally been an assistance to urbanization. Let me give as one example the cut-off dates for suspended or terminated HUD programs. Here is a brief summary of some of that:*

	Action	Effective Date
Housing Production and Mortgage Credit Programs		
Assisted Housing (Rent Supplements, Sections 235 and 236) and Public Housing	Suspended	1/5/73
College Housing	Terminated	1/5/73
Nonprofit Sponsor Assistance.	Suspended	1/5/73

*Journal of Housing, #2 Feb. 1973, National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials.

Housing Management Programs		
Public Housing Modernization	Suspended	6/30/73
Community Development Programs		
Model Cities Program	Terminated	6/30/73
Neighborhood Facilities	Terminated	6/30/73
Open Space Land	Terminated	1/5/73
Water and Sewer Facilities	Terminated	1/5/73
Urban Renewal Programs	Terminated	6/30/73 a/
Rehabilitation Loans	Terminated	6/30/73
Public Facility Loans	Terminated	1/5/73
Community Planning and Management Programs		
Community Development Training and Fellowship Programs	Terminated	6/30/73
Supplementary Grants for New Communities	Terminated	6/30/73

a/ Termination date for new approvals an appropriation request of $137.5 million will be used in FY 1974 primarily to close out urban renewal projects approved in prior years.

While this is going on and while our state and others are reviewing their obsolete tax structures to search for more income, the federal government is making an attempt to fill the new gaps through revenue sharing and block grants. However, funds received by local governments (counties, municipalities, and so forth), under the law may be used only for ordinary, necessary and operating maintenance programs.* These are

*Appalachia, Vol. 6, #4, Feb.-March 1973.

public safety, environmental protection, public transportation, health, recreation, libraries, some social services for the poor and aged and some reimbursement for financial administration. Despite the relatively small percentage of entitlement funds compared to needs, revenue sharing will appear to be an unbudgeted windfall for most localities. Most categorical grant programs for which federal funds had been previously specified, of which the above quoted list from HUD is typical, will go down the local drain. Lump sums will be used for local priorities, subject to free-wheeling political shenanigans. Thirty to forty years of slow progress in urban reform can go down the drain this year. There was unquestionably need for planned reform. What we now face is instant destruct and no time to properly replace. We have no state plan and no state growth policy. It is too early to conjecture what this truly means to many basic programs which have been in effective use for many years: housing, welfare, public health, public improvements of all kinds and in every conceivable area of service to growth and to growth management.

This is why I indicated at the beginning of this talk that I was going to be speaking about the growth responsibilities, responsibilities of people and their government to safeguard and to create the development programs at the local, regional, and the state levels for which we all now become uniquely responsible in recent history. This is not all bad and it could be very very good. Growing from this and other meetings of concerned citizens we must quickly, and I mean quickly, gear ourselves up to meet the impact of unlicensed and unplanned development on the one hand, and the hard core responsibilities of governing ourselves with

wisdom, efficiency, humanity, courage, and vision. This is what is entailed in a growth policy.

In all of our discussions today and in subsequent meetings, the word "vision" is a mighty important one to carry in the back of our minds and to bring forward at times when we appear to be lost in vast quantities of detail and what would appear to be limitless trouble with the man-made and natural environments. The State of Florida cannot prevent the influx of population, although it could slow it down by discouraging it if it were felt that such discouragement was essential to the welfare of the state. This may be worthy of consideration until such time as we are in a better position to deal with limitless growth. But at best, we can only slow it down. The worst we could do is nothing. We could continue to be a giant sponge until we fill and sink in our own putrid wastes. But vision is needed to establish the policy and the plans which can make the continued and inevitable growth of the state a worthwhile thing. We cannot continue imitating old growth patterns which we see all around us and which are obviously wrong. We must search for new ways in which people can live happily together in a productive life. This is the greatest of all of our responsibilities and the hardest to achieve. I sincerely hope that you will address yourselves today to the issues of responsibility and to your own responsible personal service. A great University must contribute its faculty and its graduates to an active participation in the planning for the preservation of civilization, not as the cloistered monasteries did in the dark ages of our first Christian millenium, but by the donation of their educated being to the full service of society and the betterment of the future societies which our descendents will inherit from us.

IMMIGRANT, SETTLER, OR ETHNIC: PROFILING FLORIDA'S POPULATION

Dr. Robert H. Heighton, Jr.
Assistant Professor of Anthropology
University of Florida

Planners must immediately attempt to generate a population policy for Florida before it is too late (if it isn't already). The in-migration for this state in 1970 was increasing annually at 6.8%. Some people feel that this rate of increase is much higher now. If so the in-migration into Florida has reached a level which is comparable only to periods of population movements previously due to war and natural disasters. Almost one quarter of Florida's present population has moved into the state since 1965 (Allen 1972: 1). By the year 2000 Florida's population is projected to reach 13.5 million people or over double the present population. This would be an increase of population density from 265 persons/square mile to 610/square mile by the end of this century (Pickard 1972: 38). However, even these projections might be underestimating the future magnitude of population growth. Changes are taking place so rapidly that data are stale before they can be processed. Also, it may be questionable to extrapolate from the past because there may have been a quantum change in growth patterns.

One example that comes to mind is the population projection made for Flagler County on the Atlantic coast. Flagler had a total population of 4,454 in 1970. It has been projected to have a population of 5,700 by 1980 (Saba 1973). However, ITT and its satellite corporation ITT Community Development Corporation have different plans. They have begun the Palm

Coast Development which will generate a new city of 750,000 by 1990 (Young and Dea 1972 and Bird 1972). This rapid rate of growth, the sheer projected population totals, and geographically unbalanced population distribution are producing tremendous problems in the physical and social environment and if not solved threaten to diminish our present quality of life and disrupt our life styles.

While the overall problems of in-migration are now being recognized another important and neglected aspect of Florida's population growth is its ethnic composition. Ethnic will be loosely defined in here as a pattern of living and working, among people of similar backgrounds who possess particular historical symbols, legends, and social rituals. The purpose of this paper is to examine briefly Florida's unique agglomeration of citizens of "foreign stock." The term "foreign stock" is defined by the Bureau of the Census as composed of two groups of American citizens: the foreign born and the native-born of foreign or mixed parentage. The foreign stock category thus traces foreign ethnic populations in America through at least a full generation.

In the 1969 U. S. Census of Population, the 34 million national foreign stock consisted of some 10 million foreign born and 24 million first generation native born. The foreign stock accounted for 19% of the total U. S. population in 1960 (detailed figures in Table 1, Appendix 1). The majority of the foreign stock live in urban areas, with almost 80% residing within standard metropolitan statistical areas. The geographic distribution is far from uniform and varies considerably by country of origin.

The State of Florida is unique in both its broad appeal to groups of diverse country of origin and the enormous disparity between the size of its foreign stock compared to other southern states. Ten years ago Florida ranked about tenth in the country when only 1,266 new citizens settled in the state. As Table III shows, the rank of the state's ethnic sub-populations cluster closely around the national ranking. Primary exceptions are the South American group, in which Florida ranks second to New York (and would rank first if Puerto Ricans were excluded from the category); and the Mexican and Polish immigrant groups, in which the state ranks 19th and 21st respectively. Few states, if any, match this balanced distribution of ethnic stock by country of origin.

A comparison of all SMSA's detailed Census figures shows Florida's unique position in the South. The six states classified by the Census as Deep South have a total foreign stock population residing in SMSA's of 226,000, less than half of the 567,000 citizens of foreign extraction residing in Florida SMSA's. In terms of ratios of native whites per 100 foreign stock, the Florida ratio of 1016.6 approximates the national mean (944.1), compared to ratios of 6801.7 for the Deep South and 2747.4 for the South as a whole.

The distribution of ethnic groups within Florida is sharply delineated. The Miami-Ft. Lauderdale "Gold Coast" area includes over 50% of the Florida foreign stock (Table IV). The Tampa-St. Petersburg area includes another 20%, with the remaining 30% scattered among rural Florida and the Orlando, Jacksonville, and Pensacola SMSA's.

As indicated earlier, the Miami and Tampa-St. Petersburg area foreign stock populations were extremely heterogeneous in 1960. South American

immigrant groups accounted for less than 20% of the Miami foreign stock (prior to the large scale immigration of Cubans in the last decade), and citizens of Russian extraction made up almost 16% of the Miami foreign stock (the complete breakdown for Florida SMSA's is given in Table VI). In Tampa-St. Petersburg, citizens of United Kingdom extraction were the largest group, amounting to 16% of the local foreign stock, while German ethnics totaled 15% and other Western European nations another 12%. South Americans in Tampa-St. Petersburg amounted to 10% of the foreign stock population.

These figures are all based on 1960 Census data (see Appendix II for list of the relevant tables).

During 1972 (Allen 1972) new naturalized citizens were settling in Florida at a rate of 28 persons per day. While this rate of settlement was due partly to the influx of Cuban refugees, Florida remains in third place among all states behind only New York and California as the most preferred area for settlement of new citizens.

These immigrants and ethnic groups from previous immigration waves offer the State of Florida a human resource which, if properly planned for, could (possibly) provide new and creative answers to the increasing complexities in urban life in Florida. The future of the United States as a nation and of Florida as a state does <u>not</u> lie in the shaping of a homogeneous society of undifferentiated people, <u>but rather</u>, in the development of reliable historical and cultural guidelines for the flexible structuring of human diversity in life style and personal identity.

Historically speaking, the impact of ethnic minorities on the economic development of Florida has been profound. The scattered Czech settlements

near Tampa and Keystone Heights have contributed greatly to the chicken farming industry in Florida. A large group of Swedes imported in the 1870's influenced the success of the Sanford orange groves. Immigrants from the West Indies and other locations, mostly French and British citizens, have had a decided impact on truck farming in the state. Ronald S. Spencer, Jr., Executive Vice President of the State Chamber of Commerce in 1972, recognized this asset of human resources when he said, "The upsurge in naturalized citizens in Florida is important to our economy because they generally represent skilled or professional labor and are a much needed addition to the state's labor force" (Allen 1972).

Non-planned population growth can destroy ethnic life styles and limit the input they could contribute to their own development as well as to Florida. One example of a threatened way of life of one of Florida's ethnic groups is the rural Southern small-farmer of Scot-Irish descent or the "cracker". The bearers of the "cracker" life style moved into Florida early in the 1800's and led in the Americanization of Florida (Florida Almanac 1972: 2). Increasingly this small-farmer ethnic group is being forced either to conform to the homogeneous urban scene in the shape of developments which invade the countryside, or to emigrate to less desirable areas of the United States or other countries. This is a precious human resource that is now being lost.

How can Florida's multiple ethnic heritages be protected to allow each group to make their unique contribution to the development of Florida? I feel that here the University of Florida has a responsibility to help planners at all levels of government in Florida to understand the historical, cultural, and human behavior aspects and consequences of

(1) Florida's accelerating urbanizing process; (2) the highly diverse and rapidly increasing flow of in-migration from the North (including Canada), the circum-Caribbean area and South America; (3) the increasing pace of economic and social redevelopment of the rural south; and (4) the associated processes of change in environmental quality and human life.

The University of Florida has an excellent opportunity to help planners not only understand the ethnic diversity of Florida's past and present but also to develop a series of alternative planning solutions and an implementation process. This University has numerous faculty members who have expressed an interest in doing multidisciplinary population research and service as well as a number of centers actively pursuing problems dealing with population research and planning such as the Urban and Regional Development Center, the Interdisciplinary Program on Population and Health, and the Center of Rural and Community Development.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Allen, George A. Weekly Business Review. February 6, News: Florida State Chamber of Commerce, 1972.

2. Allen, George A. Weekly Business Review. July 23, News: Florida State Chamber of Commerce.

3. Bird, Helen P. "Environment and Economic Impact of Rapid Growth on a Rural Area: Palm Coast." Environmental Affairs, Vol. 2 (1): 154-171, 1972.

4. Florida Almanac, 1972 Edition. Dukane Press, Inc. Hollywood, Florida.

5. The Kiplinger Florida Letter, February 8, 1972. Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc. Washington, D.C.

6. Pickard, Jerome. "Population in Appalachia and the United States: Year 2000." Appalachia, Vol. 5 (7): 8-41, 1972.

7. Saba, Patricia P. "Age Characteristics of Florida's Population 1970 to 1980." Population Studies. Bulletin 24, March 1972.

8. Young, Norman and Stanley Dea. "An Approach to a New City: Palm Coast." Environmental Affairs, Vol. 2 (1): 127-153, 1972.

APPENDIX I

Tables Derived from Census Data

Table 1.--Foreign Stock Population, 1960

	U.S.	% U.S. Total Pop.	Florida	% Florida Total Pop.	Memo: Florida as % of U.S. Category Total
Total Population	179,325,671	100.0	4,952,788	100.0	2.8
Foreign Stock	34,050,406	19.0	733,053	14.8	2.2
Foreign Born	9,738,143	5.4	272,161	5.5	2.8
Foreign/Mixed Parentage	24,312,263	13.6	460,892	9.3	1.9

Source: 1960 Census of Population, Vol. I., Part 1, U.S. Summary, Table 60
IBID., Vol. I., Part 11, Florida Summary, Table 38

Table 2.--Foreign Stock Population in SMSA's, 1960

	U.S.	% Total U.S. SMSA's	Total Florida SMSA's	% Total Florida SMSA's	Florida SMSA's as % U.S. SMSA Category Total
Total Population	112,885,000	100.0	3,245,000	100.0	2.9
Foreign Stock	26,128,000	23.1	591,000	18.2	2.3
Foreign Born	7,782,000	6.9	NA	-	-
Foreign/Mixed Parentage	18,346,000	16.2	NA	-	-

Source: IBID., Vol. I., Part 11, Florida Summary, Table 79
IBID., Vol. III, Part 1D, SMSA Summary, Table 1

Table 3.--Distribution of Foreign Stock by Country of Origin, 1960

Country of Origin	U.S.[1] Distribution	Florida[1] Distribution	Florida as % of U.S. Category Total	Florida Rank Among 50 States
United Kingdom	8.5%	12.6%	3.2%	9th
Ireland	5.2	3.7	1.5	11th
Scandinavia[2]	8.2	7.1	1.9	14th
Germany	12.7	12.5	2.1	13th
Italy	13.3	8.4	1.4	11th
Other Western Europe[3]	8.4	9.4	2.4	10th
Poland	8.2	4.8	1.3	21st
Other Eastern Europe[4]	7.9	6.4	1.7	13th
U.S.S.R.	9.5	7.4	2.4	10th
Asia	3.4	2.2	1.4	12th
Canada	9.3	10.6	2.4	10th
Mexico	5.1	0.5	0.2	19th
South America	1.7	12.2	15.4	2nd

1 Totals may not equal 100% due to rounding.

2 Includes Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Netherlands and Finland.

3 Includes France, Switzerland, Austria, Greece, Portugal and "Other Europe" Census category.

4 Includes Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Lithuania and Rumania

Source: IBID., Vol. I., Part 1, U.S. Summary, Table 110.

Table 4.--Country of Origin of the Florida Foreign Stock, For SMSA's, 1960

Country of Origin	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area						
	Miami	Tampa-St. Pete	Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood	W. Palm Beach	Orlando	Jacksonville	Pensacola
United Kingdom	19,286	22,427	9,772	5,982	5,118	4,495	1,331
Ireland	7,367	6,157	3,540	2,205	958	1,171	320
Scandinavia[2]	10,072	11,279	5,421	5,473	2,729	2,114	982
Germany	20,214	21,081	10,537	5,673	4,951	3,520	1,282
Italy	21,320	13,658	10,122	3,147	2,113	1,990	823
Other W. Europe[3]	23,694	17,309	5,594	3,679	2,593	2,375	1,137
Poland	18,891	3,956	3,004	1,469	1,308	1,198	359
Other E. Europe[4]	20,341	7,199	4,503	2,027	2,096	1,608	559
U.S.S.R.	41,155	3,157	3,263	1,165	1,029	1,278	251
Asia	5,931	1,611	856	583	796	2,806	743
Canada	17,334	17,249	9,292	5,037	4,752	3,501	1,080
Mexico	1,080	678	179	331	171	206	130
South America	50,301	14,715	4,001	4,851	2,254	1,387	333
Other/Not Reported	7,212	2,094	1,602	666	840	813	141
TOTAL	264,828	142,570	71,686	42,288	31,708	28,462	9,471
% State Total[1]	36.1%	19.5%	9.8%	5.8%	4.3%	3.9%	1.3%

Table 4. (continued)

1 Totals add to 80.7% of Total State Foreign Stock. The remaining 19.3% of the Foreign Stock reside outside of SMSA's.

2
3 Footnotes same as Table 3.
4

SOURCE: IBID., Vol. I., Part 11, Florida Summary Table 79.

Table 5.--Distribution of Florida Foreign Stock by Country of Origin, by Florida SMSA's, 1960

Country of Origin	Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area						
	Miami	Tampa-St. Pete	Ft. Lauderdale Hollywood	W. Palm Beach	Orlando	Jacksonville	Pensacola
United Kingdom	2.7%	3.1%	1.3%	0.8%	0.7%	0.6%	0.2%
Ireland	1.0	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.2	-
Scandinavia[2]	1.4	1.5	0.7	0.7	0.4	0.3	0.1
Germany	2.8	2.9	1.4	0.8	0.7	0.5	0.2
Italy	2.9	1.9	1.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	-
Other W. Europe[3]	3.2	2.4	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.1
Poland	2.6	0.5	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.2	-
Other E. Europe[4]	2.8	1.0	0.6	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.1
U.S.S.R.	5.6	0.4	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.3	0.1
Asia	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1
Canada	2.4	2.4	1.3	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.1
Mexico	0.1	0.1	-	0.1	-	-	-
South America	6.9	2.0	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.1
TOTAL % of State Foreign Stock	36.1%	19.5%	9.8%	5.8%	4.3%	3.9%	1.3%

1 Totals may not add due to rounding and to responses where counting of origin was not indicated. See also Footnote 1, Table 4.

2

3 Footnotes same as Table 3.

4

SOURCE: IBID., Vol. I., Part 11, Florida Summary, Table 79.

Table 6.--Distribution of Foreign Stock by Country of Origin, for Individual Florida SMSA's, 1960

Country of Origin	Standard Metropolitan Statisical Area[1]						
	Miami	Tampa-St. Pete	Ft. Lauderdale Hollywood	W. Palm Beach	Orlando	Jacksonville	Pensacola
United Kingdom	7.5%	15.7%	13.6%	14.1%	16.1%	15.8%	14.0%
Ireland	2.8	4.3	4.9	5.2	3.0	4.1	3.4
Scandinavia[2]	3.8	7.9	7.6	12.9	8.6	7.4	10.4
Germany	7.6	14.8	14.7	13.4	15.6	12.4	13.5
Italy	8.1	9.6	14.1	7.4	6.7	7.0	8.7
Other W. Europe[3]	8.9	12.1	7.8	8.7	8.2	8.3	12.0
Poland	7.2	2.8	4.2	3.5	4.1	4.2	3.4
Other E. Europe[4]	7.7	5.0	6.3	4.8	6.6	5.6	5.9
U.S.S.R.	15.5	2.2	4.5	2.8	3.2	4.5	2.7
Asia	2.2	1.1	1.2	1.4	2.5	9.9	7.8
Canada	6.5	12.1	13.0	11.9	15.0	12.3	11.4
Mexico	0.4	0.5	0.2	0.8	0.5	0.7	1.4
South America	19.0	10.3	5.6	11.5	7.1	4.9	3.5
TOTAL	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

1
2
3
4 Footnotes same as Table 5.

Source: IBID., Vol. I., Part 11, Florida Summary, Table 79.

SMSA Foreign Stock by Country of Origin, by SMSA's, 1960

	Country of Origin									
avia[2]	Germany	Italy	Other West. Europe	Poland	Other East. Europe	USSR	Asia	Canada	Mexico	South America
	30.0%	40.0%	42.0%	62.7%	52.9%	80.2%	44.5%	30.0%	38.9%	64.6%
	21.3	25.7	30.7	13.0	18.7	6.2	12.1	29.6	24.4	18.9
		19.0	9.9	9.9	11.7	6.4	6.4	16.0	6.5	5.1
		5.9	6.5	4.9	5.3	2.3	4.4	8.6	11.9	6.2
		4.0	4.6	4.3	5.5	2.0	6.0	8.2	6.2	2.9
		3.7	4.2	4.0	4.2	2.5	21.1	6.0	7.4	1.8
		1.5	2.0	1.2	1.5	0.5	5.6	1.9	4.7	0.4
		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

T: 'e 7.--Distribution of Florida SMSA Foreign Stock by Country of Origin, by SMSA's, 1960

	Country of Origin												
	United Kingdom	Ireland	Scandinavia[2]	Germany	Italy	Other West. Europe	Poland	Other East. Europe	USSR	Asia	Canada	Mexico	South America
Miami	28.8%	33.9%	26.4%	30.0%	40.0%	42.0%	62.7%	52.9%	80.2%	44.5%	30.0%	38.9%	64.6%
Tampa-St. Pete	32.5	28.3	29.6	31.3	25.7	30.7	13.0	18.7	6.2	12.1	29.6	24.4	18.9
Ft. Lauderdale-Hollywood	14.2	16.3	14.2	15.7	19.0	9.9	9.9	11.7	6.4	6.4	16.0	6.5	5.1
W. Palm Beach	8.8	10.2	14.4	8.4	5.9	6.5	4.9	5.3	2.3	4.4	8.6	11.9	6.2
Orlando	7.4	4.4	7.2	7.4	4.0	4.6	4.3	5.5	2.0	6.0	8.2	6.2	2.9
Jacksonville	6.5	5.4	5.6	5.2	3.7	4.2	4.0	4.2	2.5	21.1	6.0	7.4	1.8
Pensacola	1.9	1.5	2.6	1.9	1.5	2.0	1.2	1.5	0.5	5.6	1.9	4.7	0.4
TOTAL[1]	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

[1] Totals may not add due to rounding

[2]
[3] Footnotes same as Table 3.
[4]

SOURCE: IBID., Vol. I., Part 11, Florida Summary, Table 79

APPENDIX II

LIST OF RELEVANT TABLES FROM 1960 CENSUS OF POPULATION

U.S. Summary

Vol. 1, Part 1, Table 69	Country of Origin of the Foreign Stock, for the United States, Urban and Rural, 1960
Vol. 1, Part 1, Table 108	Nativity and Parentage, by Color, by Regions, Divisions and States: 1960
Vol. 1, Part 1, Table 110	Country of Origin of the Foreign Stock, by Regions, Divisions and States: 1960
Vol. 1, Part 1, Table 158	Age by Race, Nativity and Sex, for the United States, Urban and Rural: 1960
Vol. 1, Part 1 Table 159	Cumulative Age Groups, by Nativity, Color, and Sex, for the United States: 1960
Vol. 1, Part 1, Table 162	Country of Origin of the Foreign Stock, by Nativity, Color and Sex, for the United States: 1960
Vol. 1, Part 1, Table 163	Country of Birth of Foreign-Born Population, by Color, for the United States: 1960
Vol. 1, Part 1, Table 270	Median Age, by Race, Nativity and Sex, by Regions, Divisions, and States: 1960
Vol. 1, Part 1, Table 287	Median Age by Race, Nativity and Sex, for SMSA's of 250,000 or More: 1960

Florida Summary

Vol. 1, Part 11, Table #	
Table 40	Country of Origin of the Foreign Stock, for the State of Florida, Urban and Rural: 1960
Table 38	Nativity and Parentage, by Color, for the State of Florida, Urban and Rural: 1960
Table 79	Country of Origin of the Foreign Stock, for (selected) SMSA's, Urbanized Areas, and Urban Places of 10,000 or more: 1960
Table 96	Age by Race, Nativity and Sex, for the State of Florida, for Urban and Rural Areas, and for SMSA's of 100,000 or more: 1960
Table 97	Cumulative Age Groups, by Nativity, Color, and Sex for the State of Florida: 1960

Table 99	Country of Origin of the Foreign Stock, by Nativity, Color and Sex, for the State of Florida: 1960
--------	Country of Birth of Foreign Born Population, by Color, for the State of Florida; 1960

SMSA Summary

Vol. 3, Part 1D, Table 5	Place of Birth of Population and Foreign Stock, by Color, and Parentage of the Native White Population, for SMSA's: 1970
	(US, Coterminous US, South, Florida, Individual Florida SMSA's and "Miami Combination" only)

URBAN, INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL INTERRELATIONSHIPS IN THE FLORIDA ECONOMY

B. R. Eddleman
Associate Professor of Food and Resource Economics
University of Florida

Introduction

A major concern in our state is the increasingly complex interrelationship of various sectors of economic activity. One technique which has been developed for understanding and measuring this interrelationship is input-output. This method requires measurement of the purchases of each sector from all others and at the same time the sales of each sector to all others, and the information developed from this approach is usually reported as output, income, or employment multipliers.

The purpose of this paper is to briefly report the results of an input-output analysis of the Florida economy.[1] Information is presented with regard to output and income multipliers and export-import relationships. Regional economists, state planners, managers of industry and others interested in Florida's future should find this an adjunct to planning, forecasting, and a variety of other types of research.

Florida Input-Output Results

Information from the input-output study forms the basis for understanding the economic structure of Florida's economy. In order to fully

---

[1] This study was carried out by Farler (1), and is reported in detail by Farler and Tyner (2).

utilize this information, one must understand the concept of multipliers.

The act of spending is not to be regarded as an isolated, terminal event. Rather, increases or decreases in the expenditures of firms or households must be considered in their entirety. Because there exists an interdependency among individual economic units, attention has to be given to the ensuing economic effects of such expenditures. Therefore, the overall change in spending generated by the expansion or contraction of a particular industry is of major concern to private and public planners.

A dollar spent by one economic unit constitutes receipts to other units that will in turn spend a portion of their revenue, creating receipts, although smaller, for yet another group of units. The extent of change in the revenue stream generated by an initial change in expenditure pursued through a large number of rounds of spending and respending can be determined by means of a "multiplier." Once the multiplier has been computed, it permits a quantitative evaluation of the total impact upon employment, income, and output resulting from a given change in final demand for a given sector. The following briefly describes some of the multipliers associated with the Florida input-output analysis.

Processing Sectors

The 44 sectors shown in Table 1 constitute the Processing sectors of the Florida economy. These sectors are grouped under the industry headings of Agriculture; Mining; Construction; Manufacturing; Trade; Transportation; Communication; and Utilities; and Service and Miscellaneous. The basic characteristic of these industries is that the production

and sales of their constituent economic sectors are directly related to each other. The significance of this relationship is that the production and marketing decisions in the Processing sectors of the economy are truly economic in nature as far as the state's economy is concerned. That is, the 44 sectors are interrelated with, and a function of, the level of Florida economic activity.

Output Multipliers

Table 1 shows the total requirements (and rankings) for the 44 Processing sectors resulting from a one-dollar change in final demand for each of the sectors. Final demands are defined as sales from a processing sector to either households for personal consumption, government, or exports out of the state. These requirements are often called "output multipliers" and are not to be confused with the "income multipliers" discussed later in this section. To illustrate, a one-dollar increase in final demand in the Vegetable Products sector will generate a $2.04 increase in output for the combined Processing sectors.

Processing sectors with relatively large output multipliers in Agriculture are the livestock and livestock products, and vegetable products sectors. In Manufacturing the largest output multipliers were found in the canned, cured and frozen foods; other food and kindred products; lumber and wood products; paper and allied products, printing and publishing; chemical and allied products; and the petroleum products sectors. Electricity, gas, water and sanitary services; business services; and other economic activity, including new construction, are other sectors with relatively large output multipliers.

Export-Import

Another type of analysis is an examination of the exchange of goods and services between Florida and other regions. A summary of Florida's 1967 exports and imports for each of the 44 Processing sectors is shown in Table 2. The first column of the table shows the relationship developed by subtracting imports from exports. A number in parentheses indicates that imports are higher than exports for that particular sector. The second column shows the rank of a particular sector with regard to its net exports, and the final column indicates the percent of a sector's total output of goods and services that is exported (or imported) for the Florida-based industries.

An examination of Table 2 indicates that a number of the 44 Processing sectors are engaged in relatively significant amounts of trade outside of Florida. Two of these, including Sector 2, Citrus Products; and Sector 3, Vegetable Products, are agricultural industries. The unique winter fruit and vegetable industry in Florida supplies much of the U. S. and world winter markets. One of the sectors, Chemical Fertilizer and Fertilizer Materials Mining, is a mining industry. Phosphate mining no doubt accounts for the bulk of exports in this sector. Two sectors, including Sector 11, Ordnance and Accessories; and Sector 12, Canned, Cured and Frozen Foods, are large net export manufacturing industries; while three manufacturing sectors, including Sector 13, Other Food and Kindred Products; Sector 27, Fabricated Metal Products; and Sector 30, Transportation Equipment are relatively large importers among the manufacturing industries. Military procurement of much of the aerospace and aircraft output accounts for the large net export position of

the Ordnance and Accessories sector. The orange juice industry (both canned and frozen) no doubt accounts for the bulk of exports in the Canned, Cured and Frozen Foods sector. Many of the largest exporting sectors are associated with the state's tourist and travel industry (i.e., Sector 33, Wholesale and Retail Trade; Sector 34, Transportation and Warehousing; Sector 39, Hotels and Lodging; and Sector 40, Personal and Repair Services). These 12 sectors accounted for about 78 percent of the total exports and about 54 percent of the total imports of the state in 1967.

Income Payments and Income Multiplier Analysis

Increased requirements of an industry in the Processing sectors mean increased payments to that portion of primary inputs which is attributed to households in the form of wages, salaries, dividends, proprietor's income, and rents. This "direct" increase in consumer income is accompanied by a chain reaction in the Processing sectors leading to further "indirect" changes in income payments to members of households by those industries supplying inputs to the industry in which the original change occurred. These changes constitute the basis for calculating the Type I income multiplier. The Type I income multiplier is defined for each Processing sector as the sum of the direct and indirect household payments, divided by the direct household payments.[2]

[2]For the Florida model, no attempt was made to allocate primary inputs to households, government, or savings. The primary input figures thus represent a rough approximation of gross income before taxes. To the extent that these figures are overstatements of income, the income multipliers will be biased upward. However, since no account of the "induced" effect of household spending is being accounted for, the multipliers should not be overly affected by this accounting procedure.

A summary of various income payments and the Type I multipliers are presented in Table 3. The three income columns (i.e., direct, direct and indirect, and indirect) are income payments to members of households for every dollar change in final demand from the Processing sectors.

The relative size of the multiplier for a particular sector is a function of the proportion of purchases from all the Processing sectors, i.e., the degree of interdependence between the relevant Processing sectors. A high direct payment to households limits the proportion of purchases that can be made within the Processing sectors. Moreover, a strong dependence on imports will decrease the size of the multiplier because payments made for imported goods and services leave the state's economy. Consequently, money going out of the state cannot induce further chain reactions within the state except through increased purchases of the state'e exports stimulated by a rise in other regions' incomes.

Examination of Table 3 reveals that low direct income payments to members of households are often associated with high income multipliers. The Livestock and Livestock Products; Vegetable Products, Canned, Cured and Frozen Foods; Other Food and Kindred Products; Paper and Allied Products; Chemical and Allied Products; and Petroleum Products sectors had the relatively lowest direct income and coefficients and the largest Type I income multipliers. Similarly, the Metal Ores, Crude Petroleum and Natural Gas; Wholesale and Retail Trade; Transportation and Warehousing; Communications; Real Estate and Rental; and Medical, Educational, Legal, and Other Non-Profit Organization sectors had relatively high direct income coefficients and low income multipliers. Many of these sectors also are relatively large importers of goods and services from other regions.

Many of the largest income multipliers appear in those sectors engaged in the production, processing, and distribution of food items. For example, Livestock and Livestock Products; Vegetable Products; Canned, Cured and Frozen Foods; and Other Food and Kindred Products sectors rank among the top 7 sectors by size of Type I income multipliers. The relatively high multipliers for these sectors are explained by the fact that many of their goods and services are purchased from each other. One would expect the Citrus Products sector to also display a large income multiplier. Much of the income generated in this sector is in picking, packaging and hauling the crop. Since on-tree prices were used to estimate the gross value of output, pick and haul costs are allocated primarily to the orange juice manufacturing industry which is part of the Canned, Cured and Frozen Foods sector. The relatively large multiplier for this latter sector reflects these costs.

Large income multipliers are also associated with the Lumber and Wood Products, Paper and Allied Products, Chemical and Allied Products, and Petroleum Products sectors of the manufacturing industry. These sectors also display a high degree of interdependency among each other as well as with some of the agricultural producing sectors.

Table 1.--Output multipliers by sectors, Florida economy, 1967.

Sector	Output multiplier	Rank
Agriculture		
1. Livestock & livestock products	1.82	8
2. Citrus products	1.59	19
3. Vegetable products	2.04	2
4. Other agr. products	1.43	27
5. Forestry & fishing products	1.49	25
6. Agr., Forestry & fishery services	1.75	11
Mining		
7. Metal ore & crude pet. & nat. gas	1.32	32
8. Stone & clay mining & quarry	1.50	24
9. Chem. fert. & fert. material mining	1.50	24
Construction		
10. Maintenance & repair const.	1.52	23
Manufacturing		
11. Ordnance & accessories	1.64	14
12. Canned, cured & frozen foods	2.00	3
13. Other food & kindred products	1.84	6
14. Tobacco manufacture	1.61	17
15. Textile mill products	1.53	22
16. Apparel	1.29	33
17. Lumber & wood prod.	1.82	8
18. Furniture & fixtures	1.64	14
19. Paper & allied prod.	1.96	4
20. Printing & publishing	1.80	9
21. Chemical & allied products	1.93	5
22. Petroleum products	1.77	10
23. Rubber & plastic prod.	1.65	13
24. Leather & leather products	1.53	22
25. Stone, clay & glass products	1.68	12
26. Primary metals	1.50	24
27. Fabricated metal products	1.49	25
28. Machinery (except electric)	1.58	20
29. Elect. machinery	1.63	15
30. Transportation equipment	1.53	22
31. Instrument & related products	1.54	21
32. Miscellaneous manufacturing	1.60	18
Trade		
33. Wholesale & retail trade	1.34	31
Trans., Comm. & Utilities		
34. Transportation & warehousing	1.41	28
35. Communications	1.24	34
36. Elec., gas, water, sanitary services	1.83	7
Service & Misc.		
37. Finance & insurance	1.58	20
38. Real estate & rental	1.38	30
39. Hotel & lodging	1.44	26
40. Personal & repair services	1.54	21
41. Business services	1.77	10
42. Amusements, rec., motion picture	1.62	16
43. Med., educ., other non-profit orgn.	1.39	29
44. Other econ. act. & new const.	2.23	1
ECONOMY OUTPUT MULTIPLIER	1.62	

Table 2.--Summary of export-import transactions by sector, Florida economy, 1967.

Sector	Net exports[a] Value ($000)	Rank	% of total sector output
Agriculture			
1. Livestock & livestock products	(61,942)	38	(18.7)
2. Citrus products	187,826	8	56.6
3. Vegetable products	166,531	10	62.6
4. Other agr. products	22,249	17	9.2
5. Forestry & fishing products	12,185	19	16.4
6. Agr., forestry & fishery services	46,784	15	62.9
Mining			
7. Metal ore & crude pet. & nat. gas	(8,633)	24	(11.5)
8. Stone & clay mining & quarry	(1,809)	21	(7.9)
9. Chem. fert. & fert. material mining	168,318	9	79.5
Construction			
10. Maintenance & repair const.	52,113	14	10.5
Manufacturing			
11. Ordnance & accessories	230,866	6	48.6
12. Canned, cured & frozen foods	319,955	5	50.9
13. Other food & kindred products	(253,891)	44	(20.4)
14. Tobacco manufacture	(12,667)	30	(14.0)
15. Textile mill products	(11,438)	27	(37.3)
16. Apparel	(70,777)	39	(38.9)
17. Lumber & wood prod.	(15,270)	31	(7.5)
18. Furniture & fixtures	(19,730)	32	(17.0)
19. Paper & allied prod.	87,638	12	13.9
20. Printing & publishing	(21,947)	33	(6.6)
21. Chemical & allied products	59,805	13	6.3
22. Petroleum products	(6,997)	22	(23.5)
23. Rubber & plastic prod.	(8,868)	25	(13.2)
24. Leather & leather products	(7,704)	23	(28.0)
25. Stone, clay & glass products	22,418	16	6.4
26. Primary metals	(24,789)	34	(24.9)
27. Fabricated metal products	(141,008)	43	(28.0)
28. Machinery (except electric)	(37,950)	35	(10.0)
29. Elect. machinery	(73,023)	40	(17.7)
30. Transportation equipment	(127,636)	42	(28.5)
31. Instruments & related products	(9,933)	26	(15.1)
32. Miscellaneous manufacturing	(11,718)	28	(19.8)
Trade			
33. Wholesale & retail trade	1,502,994	1	27.0
Trans., Comm. & Utilities			
34. Transportation & warehousing	419,438	2	27.9
35. Communications	141,692	11	23.0
36. Elec., gas, water, sanitary services	(190)	20	(0.0)
Service & Misc.			
37. Finance & insurance	207,791	7	12.2
38. Real estate & rental	(12,449)	29	(3.6)
39. Hotel & lodging	397,591	3	67.0
40. Personal & repair service	327,760	4	41.2
41. Business services	(49,819)	36	(8.5)
42. Amusement, rec., motion picture	20,246	18	6.7
43. Med., educ., other non-profit orgn.	(98,803)	41	(8.2)
44. Other econ. act., & new const.	(61,861)	37	(4.0)
TOTALS	3,243,348		12.9

[a] Excess of exports over imports. Numbers in parenthesis indicate the amount that imports exceeded exports.

Table 3.--Income multipliers, Florida economy, 1967.

Sector	(1) Direct income effect[a]	(2) Direct & indirect income effect[b]	(3) Indirect income effect[c]	(4) Type I income multiplier[d]
Agriculture				
1. Livestock & livestock products	.3065	.7069	.4004	2.31
2. Citrus products	.6075	.8794	.2719	1.45
3. Vegetable products	.3332	.8227	.4895	2.47
4. Other agr. prod.	.6473	.8544	.2071	1.32
5. Forestry & fishing products	.6078	.8551	.2473	1.41
6. Agr., forestry & fishery services	.4934	.8617	.3683	1.75
Mining				
7. Metal ore & crude pet. & nat. gas	.6796	.8522	.1726	1.25
8. Stone & clay mining & quarry	.6089	.8700	.2611	1.43
9. Chem. fert. & fert. material mining	.6389	.9022	.2633	1.41
Construction				
10. Maint. & repair const.	.5964	.9597	.3633	1.61
Manufacturing				
11. Ordnance & accessories	.3440	.6378	.2938	1.85
12. Canned, cured & frozen foods	.3067	.8067	.5000	2.63
13. Other food & kindred products	.3043	.6819	.3776	2.24
14. Tobacco manufacture	.4692	.7985	.3293	1.70
15. Textile mill products	.3015	.5631	.2616	1.87
16. Apparel	.4155	.5570	.1415	1.34
17. Lumber & wood prod.	.4307	.8493	.4186	1.97
18. Furniture & fixtures	.4408	.7531	.3123	1.71
19. Paper & allied prod.	.4275	.8740	.4465	2.04
20. Printing & publishing	.4911	.8703	.3792	1.77
21. Chemical & allied products	.3960	.8206	.4246	2.07
22. Petroleum products	.2269	.6807	.4538	3.0
23. Rubber & plastic prod.	.4975	.7998	.3023	1.61
24. Leather & leather products	.4224	.6491	.2267	1.54
25. Stone, clay & glass products	.5358	.8801	.3443	1.64
26. Primary metals	.4335	.6857	.2522	1.58
27. Fabricated metal products	.4064	.6433	.2369	1.58
28. Machinery (except electric)	.4742	.7560	.2818	1.59
29. Elect. machinery	.4339	.7325	.2986	1.69
30. Transportation equipment	.3736	.6215	.2479	1.66
31. Instruments & related products	.5129	.7746	.2617	1.51
32. Miscellaneous manufacturing	.4406	.7352	.2946	1.67
Trade				
33. Wholesale & retail trade	.7301	.8922	.1621	1.22

Table 3.--Income multipliers, Florida economy, 1967 (continued).

Sector	(1) Direct income effect[a]	(2) Direct & indirect income effect[b]	(3) In-direct income effect[c]	(4) Type I income multi-plier[d]
Trans., Comm. & Utilities				
34. Transportation & warehousing	.6482	.8639	.2157	1.33
35. Communications	.8195	.9419	.1224	1.15
36. Elec., gas, water, sanitary services	.4943	.8613	.3670	1.74
Service and Misc.				
37. Finance & insurance	.5687	.8714	.3027	1.53
38. Real estate & rental	.7234	.9268	.2034	1.28
39. Hotel & lodging	.6085	.8326	.2241	1.37
40. Personal & repair service	.4823	.7608	.2785	1.58
41. Business services	.4518	.8478	.3960	1.88
42. Amusements, rec., motion picture	.5532	.8819	.3287	1.59
43. Med., educ., other non-profit orgn.	.6818	.8789	.1971	1.29
44. Other econ. activity & new const.	--	--	--	--
ECONOMY MULTIPLIER[e]				1.69

[a]The primary input row of the technical coefficients matrix represents gross income before taxes per dollar change in output.

[b]The column sum of each column entry in the interdependence matrix times the direct primary or direct income effect listed in the primary input row (a) above.

[c]Column 2 minus column 1.

[d]Column 2 divided by column 1.

[e]The economy multiplier is the sum of the income multiplier divided by the number of sectors. Sector 44 was not included due to unreliability of the national coefficients in computing the Florida coefficients.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Farler, Carl. "An Interindustry Analysis of the Florida Economy." Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Kentucky, Lexington: 1972.

2. Farler, Carl and Fred H. Tyner. An Interindustry Analysis of the Florida Economy (currently in publication process). Fla. Agr. Exp. Stas. Bulletin, University of Florida, Gainesville.

PROBLEMS FACED BY AN EMERGING SOUTHERN CITY

Mayor Richard Jones
City of Gainesville

The City of Gainesville and the State of Florida are in a unique position in the South and in the nation. Gainesville is a very young urban area and as yet it has not experienced the severe urban problems which have plagued such cities as New Orleans, Atlanta, Knoxville, Birmingham, and Charleston. Florida is also a young state. Despite the heavy concentrations of people in the Fort Lauderdale-Miami area and the Tampa-St. Petersburg region and the rapid growth of Jacksonville-Duval County, the state is also in the early stages of urbanization. Several other Southern states have experienced urban problems for two hundred years while Florida has encountered them only since the 1950's.

Urban areas in Florida today face three major problems. First, cities in this state are governed by a relatively uniformed state legislature. Most of the legislators are from the rural areas of Florida or from the bedroom suburbs and have seldom experienced urban problems except when they go shopping in the city or drive to the bank. Urban problems are decidedly different from those problems encountered in the rural areas or even in the suburbs. As urban life is basically much more complex and diverse than that of the suburb or rural area, so are its problems, and, presumably, their solutions. For example, political leaders of a suburban community might have to concern themselves with garbage collection on a bi-weekly basis. City fathers, however, must

see to garbage collection on a daily basis, find ways to rid the city of all the refuse and deal with unionized garbage collectors.

Because most state legislators are not from urban districts, they have at best limited experience in urban politics. Most Florida legislators have risen to state office through backgrounds in state politics or state party organization. Many have no political background at all. Thus they do not understand urban problems and do not appreciate them. Yet they go to Tallahassee and readily assume they know what the city needs to cure its ills. Seldom do they listen to the requests made by city officials. For example, the city commissioners of Gainesville recently asked the city's legislative delegation to approve the expansion of the city limits to include those suburban areas which are using the city's water, electricity and police but are not paying taxes for these services. The legislative delegation refused the requests arguing that further investigation was needed before the proposal could be approved. Actually, they rejected the proposal because they knew approval would jeopardize their reelection chances.

The second problem facing Gainesville is its history. North Florida in general and Gainesville in particular are trying to hold on to their historical heritages. Despite the rapid urbanization in Gainesville, many citizens, especially from old, established families, still see it as a pleasant, sleepy southern community. They are unwilling or psychologically unprepared to accept the community for what it is: a rapidly expanding urban area.

Thus the government is still being run by men on the back of a pick-up truck by men who have little background in urban problems to deal with

the tasks at hand. There really is no mayor. Instead, there are five city commissioners who elect one of themselves to serve as mayor. Yet, they still retain their independence and the mayor is nothing more than a figurehead. Furthermore, there is no formal staff to handle the duties of city government. Restructuring the local government is clearly necessary. But the longer the public waits, the more difficult the rapid urbanization is to handle.

The final problem is one of bureaucracy. Regulations and restrictions of all kinds inhibit vigorous activity by city government. The state forbids the city from raising its millage rate. The Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Pollution Control and other federal and state agencies order the city to conform to the letter of their anti-pollution regulations. Federal and state agencies and bureaucracies insist that Gainesville must follow certain procedures or have funds revoked. Yet to follow the prescriptions costs money which the city can scarcely raise, if at all. Thus the city is caught in an economic vise. As a result it is barely able to carry on its essential programs and unable to institute new programs designed to struggle with the problems of urbanization.

These, then, are the three fundamental problems of a growing urban area. The best solution to this situation would be to give cities full home rule. It has been tried elsewhere, sometimes with only indifferent success. But it can be made to work. If the city decides it needs to raise additional revenue and its citizens agree, it should be allowed to do so. Cities need to be allowed to determine their own destiny. At present, Gainesville does not have the financial capability or the governmental efficiency to cope with its urban problems. Unless the

city is allowed to have these privileges, the city will be forced to wallow in the havoc rendered by urbanization. The city will simply duplicate the situations in the Northeast cities and dilapidated cities elsewhere in America and the world.

One hopeful answer then is home rule. And within the provisions of home rule, the city needs a strong mayor government even while it retains a city manager. The two should be separate but not independent. Particularly, the city manager must be subordinate to the mayor. Under this structure the mayor can initiate ideas and lead his city. The city manager, as administrator, would necessarily be responsive to him. The citizens need to realize that city government is big business and as such there should be one central figure who is responsible for its effectiveness. Failure to recognize the needs of the city and to allow it to deal with these problems can only result in a city which will quickly be innundated by the problems of urbanization.

BALANCE IN URBAN GROWTH

Mayor Herman Goldner
City of St. Petersburg

Based upon my experience and observations, I believe that a symposium on Southern Urbanization can be misleading. Urbanization is not a regional problem nor does it exhibit peculiar characteristics in the South. Urban problems in Rio de Janeiro, Moscow, New York or Miami are all relatively the same, particularly in the areas of housing, sewage, water, and medical services. Therefore, I see no essential difference between urbanization in the South and its counterparts elsewhere. Indeed, it is precisely because these similarities exist that we need to take a hard look at the rapidly urbanizing South. We are at a unique vantage point in the development of the South; it is not yet too late to apply the lessons of past urban growth to the present situation.

It is important to understand also that urbanization involves the total environment; it is a way of life. When we talk about preserving our urban society, we are alluding to many factors, not just air and water purification. To deal adequately with the urban setting, the public has to consider housing, transportation, education, medical service delivery, water and air pollution, poverty and a host of other problems. It also means that the city has to provide for cultural growth and diversity and opportunities for minority groups.

While many groups and individuals recognize and wish to deal with these urban problems, it is, unfortunately, sometimes the case that

their goals and methods are not practicable or realistic. For example, a primary defect of the environmental movement in our society is its specificity. To many environmentalists the answer to all our problems is water and air purification and the preservation of our wildlife and natural resources. They emphasize these problems to such an extent thay they neglect our other pressing urban problems. In fact, if one carried their argument to its logical conclusion they would turn the country back to the Indians, provided they could choose the Indians. Today we need less emphasis on one particular aspect of our environment and more emphasis on an environmental balance. Balance should be the goal in urban America. It is a serious error not to recognize the danger inherent in over-emphasizing any single aspect of the urban scene. It is the function of government, among other social institutions, to see that the desired urban balance is sought and achieved.

Government chooses the needs of urban societies. It determines priorities and establishes a balance among them through the allocation of resources. However, up to now government has been largely unable to cope with the problems of growth and of people. Indeed, fragmented government has been the key element in the inability of society to deal with increased urbanization. For example, in Pinellas County, Florida, it has done the people of St. Petersburg no good to build a tertiary sewage plant system when the citizens of Tampa, located directly across the Bay, refused to build a similar system. As a result, sewage is pumped into Tampa Bay polluting all of the water, to the detriment of both cities. Decisions must be made, priorities need to be determined, and resources have to be allocated at a level of government where

they can actually become effective, and thus avoid the errors of Pinellas County.

Solutions to these urban problems can only be achieved by statute. However, zoning, often prescribed as a panacea for such problems, is not the answer. Zoning is at best a halfway step which often generates more headaches in the long run. For instance, urban sprawl, one of the most severe urban problems, has been generated by zoning laws. These laws which have been used to reduce density in the city have consequently spread people out from the city. They have also given rise to increased urban costs. An example will serve to illustrate this point. In St. Petersburg recently, the city bought ten acres of land in a ghetto community for $20,000 an acre. The original intention of the city fathers was to make the area into a public park, but the people of the area needed and demanded more housing. The mayor then decided to build the needed housing instead of the park. At the same time, the city council was looking at the problem of housing densities in the city. It decided to reduce densities in St. Petersburg from 45 housing units an acre to 24 in one year and then down to 14 units in another year. If the city were to build 14 units an acre in that ghetto it would cost the city nearly $2,000 a unit for the land, at a minimum, and an additional $12,500 per unit for the construction. The people could not afford such housing. In addition, the low density rate would prevent enough units from being built to ease the housing shortage. The essential problem of providing adequate housing for minorities and impoverished people is cost. Because of the effects of zoning on costs, however, it proves to be a quite inadequate solution.

Instead of zoning we need to identify each section of land purchased by the city government, calculate its characteristics, and lastly, determine what its best use should be. In this latter context the determination should be based on the city's goals and priorities. All these factors will permit an orderly, coherent growth pattern. In Pinellas County today government leaders are able to select the nature and character of work needed for the people in the county and to integrate fully with the abilities of the people and with the needs of the environment. But none of this can be done under present government structures. City and town governments are not of sufficient size or power to ensure such development. A city's plan to insure orderly growth can be effectively negated by a neighboring city's failure to do so. What we need today is regional government which can transcend county, city and town lines and achieve land planning of sufficient area to be effective. We need systems of government of such size so that when air and water pollution standards are enacted, they can be enforced for the protection of all surrounding peoples. In addition, when local government leaders talk about land use, the land area has to be sufficiently diversified so that they can have an economic model of meaningful nature.

Systems are needed at the federal, state and local level to determine what would be economically best for a state or region. For example, such systems could determine whether Florida should continue to be actively involved in agriculture, or give it up, or reduce its commitment. Similarly, standards of cost benefit analysis are needed to ensure better judgements by political leaders for the whole range of policy problems. Not all issues, of course, can be so systematically

examined. Nevertheless, the effort must be made. Unless regional plans are implemented soon in Florida, urbanization will generate problems that cannot be remedied, and all hope of restoring a balance in urban structures will be lost.

Any such political program which is so broad in scope must also allow for the individual. People need not feel isolated by regional government. In a regional plan there should be a scheme which permits broad ranges of local initiative and individual freedom, even while it establishes certain minimum standards. For instance, if a certain neighborhood wants more police protection and more garbage collection, it should be permitted to have them if it is willing to pay for them. Thus the public feels that its desires can be achieved and its voice can be heard. Planning in a democracy should not preclude individual initiative and freedom. Regional government does not destroy individual liberty but adds to it. In today's urban world we need discipline to survive but individuals should be given as much latitude as possible within a planning framework.

Regional government and total land plan use are essential to a viable urban society. Without such an approach efforts to deal with the urban problems of housing, public health, transportation, water, and police protection will always fall short of success. Moreover, without such an approach, the coordination and integration of activity needed to achieve and preserve urban balance will be clearly impossible to secure.

THE URBANIZATION OF SOUTHERN POLITICS

Manning J. Dauer
Professor of Political Science

Southern politics is showing the strong effects of urbanism. This corresponds with the change in southern living stemming from industrialism and from urbanization which is common to the South as well as to the United States as a whole. Thirty years ago the majority of the South's population was rural; today two-thirds is urban. In the past thirty years the percentage of the South's population which is urban has changed from 48.9% to 64.1%. This compares with the United States urban percentage of 73.5%.

On the other hand, the southern region is growing more rapidly than any other section of the country. This shows a reverse trend from previous periods when other sections of the country were growing more rapidly. The growth of the South in population from 1960 to 1970 was by 24.1%, or twice the growth rate of any other U. S. region. The result is that southern politics is changing more rapidly in response to a new urban type of living. Agriculture, formerly a pillar of the southern economy, is still of importance but is rapidly giving way to manufacturing, retail and wholesale business, professional business, and service occupations. In this respect, Florida is an outstanding example. But it's growth is not so typical of the rest of the South in that its urban percentage of 80.5% is the highest in the South. Also it has more service industry and less manufacturing. Also, although all of the South is becoming less traditional bound and new leadership, business,

professional, and political, has ample opportunity. Florida is probably the least tradition influenced of all of the southern states.

These figures give the general characteristics from the socio-economic standpoint, but what is more important are a series of changes in the style of southern life, in race relations, in governmental organization, and in the rise of a two party system.

One reason for the rapid growth rate of the South is the relative absence of crowding, a plentiful labor supply from the agricultural areas in which fewer workers are required, and the absence, in most areas of the South of intensive unionization of labor. At the same time there are fewer great metropolitan centers. Even in much of the urban South many workers simply drive in from the rural areas on which part of the family may continue some farming. All of these factors serve to promote rather high productivity by southern labor and to prove attractive for new industry.

The above statement of southern industrialization, growth in population, and the spread of industry to smaller cities raises a question. Is the development of industry in this fashion simply symptomatic of early industrialization as in other areas of the United States and Europe and symptomatic of exploitation, or may there be a greater sense of community in the greater spread of industry in the South? Are new urban patterns of living and politics possible? These are interesting topics for speculation with divergent tendencies in southern politics.

Balancing the growth motif, characteristic of most of the South, is a new concern, in some parts of the South for protection of the environment, for the quality of life, and concern about over-concentration

of population. The new politics of urbanism, especially in the South where air conditioning is necessary, gives rise to concern over energy sources, over control of water pollution, and over access to recreation facilities. This concern is new and is the product of the last five or ten years. In Florida it has led to the proposal of and adoption by popular referendum of an ordinance in Boca Raton, Florida to limit the population to no more than 45,000 and adjust population density regulations as to building permits and zoning on that basis. The idea is to control the maximum population of the community. Many other laws are being adopted in the southern states to control water pollution, more stringent zoning requirements are being adopted, and there is much public concern over access to beaches, lakes and rivers, over adequate parks, and over recreational facilities. These are new aspects of politics which reflect the urbanism of the South. Another development along this line is the concern over noise and other pollution leading to cancellation of a new large international airport outside Miami and on the edge of the Everglades. Politically there are three prerequisites before the environmental issue comes to the forefront. These prerequisites are (1) rapid growth in an already developed area with dense population; (2) relatively high income in the area; and (3) development of natural resource problems. When this happens then the environmental and population control issue cuts across Republican vs. Democratic and liberal vs. conservative lines. In fact, it may be an issue of greatest concern in a high income conservative area. In some sections it then may generate an opposition or growth syndrome which can unite developers, labor unions, blacks and some women to favor the growth motif. There

are interesting alternative political combinations in this entire development.

Turning to another development, the politics of gerontology is important in certain areas of the South where retirement communities are growing. For example, this is true of the west coast Gulf area of Florida and along certain other areas of Georgia and Alabama. In some of these areas those over 65 constitute more than 35% of the county population. This older population is not so concerned with meeting the problems of growth as are the areas of the South with younger children. Therefore in the retirement communities it is difficult to get public school bonds passed or taxes for the support of education. In other areas of the South where the population is younger, the idea is to catch up and provide better schools. There is not the same syndrome as in the North of freezing school support at present levels or regressing, but in the retirement areas of the South there is heavy resistance to public expenditures for education or for other purposes.

Still another development is in the field of race relations. Since the 1954 decision in Brown v. Topeka, Kansas which decreed the integration of schools the southern counties have moved in the forefront of change in accepting the need for some racial integration in the schools. William Buckley, whom we all know as a conservative columnist and TV commentator, made a recent visit to Jackson, Mississippi. He then wrote a column in which he made the point that he had been a sharp critic of the Brown decision, but had to confess it had led to actual integration in Jackson in the schools, public facilities, and acceptance of this necessity by the white community. He was rather startled at the rate

of change and is an honest enough observer that he thought he had to comment on the style of changes that were taking place.

Now if this was only Jackson, Mississippi, it would not be so notable. But the fact is this is a change generally throughout the South. It is a change, moreover, that has been accepted by many southern business and professional groups. One of the results is that while southern income levels, black and white, lag behind national averages, the southern average per capita income is increasing toward the national average. Moreover, black per capita income in the South, while also lower than black income in other regions, is increasing more rapidly than is black income elsewhere. Slowly the general southern average is increasing toward the national average, and black income averages are increasing somewhat more, especially outside the agricultural areas of the South. This means more opportunities for middle class blacks and their increase in the South.

Another characteristic of southern urbanization and the new South business leadership is an emphasis on political and government structural change. That is, with the advent of Reynolds v. Sims, the United States Supreme Court decision which prescribed one-man, one-vote, all of the southern states have been sharply reapportioned. Generally this has ended the domination of rural legislators and has changed the pattern of the southern legislative assemblies. A recent 1972 publication edited by William C. Harvard, The Changing Politics of the South (LSU Press, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1972) stresses the changing characteristic of southern politics in legislatures in for example, Virginia (chapter by Ralph Eisenberg, pp. 39-91) and Florida (chapter by Manning

J. Dauer, pp. 92-164). Then there has resulted from these legislatures a change in appropriation patterns so that more tax money is going into urban areas. Also, by structural change, I mean that in many instances there has been adoption of new forms of government for counties and cities. This is all the more necessary because we do not have present local government units with the right geographic limits to face new problems of water resources or of planning. The old units of counties and cities cannot do the job. We are turning to new units like regional governments, for example, in Georgia and Tennessee. Such a program for Florida is now being proposed. Another necessary element is transfer of certain functions to the state or regional level such as environmental standards, matters of large scale development in planning and zoning, access to recreation and allocation of water resources. For example, Georgia and Tennessee have a fairly comprehensive system of regional governments such as are now also under consideration for Florida. Florida has revised the state constitution in 1968.

Another example of structural change is that the administration of state government has been reorganized so that instead of some 155 departments, the number has been reduced to not more than 25. At the local and county level, new types of government organizations are being adopted in Florida and elsewhere. For example, there are new county charters allowing the county administrator form of government. In many areas there has been successful consolidation, county, local, and some regional. I refer here to the consolidation in metropolitan Dade County and also some consolidation in Jacksonville, Birmingham, Atlanta, and Nashville.

The urbanization of the South has also betokened the end of the one party system and the beginning of a two party system. In 1972 the number of Democratic legislators in southern states was 2,019 and the number of Republican legislators was 348. In Congress the number of Democrats in the House was 92 and Republicans numbered 47. In the U. S. Senate there were 17 Democrats and 12 Republicans. There were 4 Republican governors and 11 Democrats in the South in 1972. Recent Republican governors have included Winthrop Rockefeller in Arkansas and Claude Kirk in Florida.

In presidential politics, a tabulation of results by presidential election years by states is shown in Table 1. In the last six presidential elections, as Table 1 shows, Republicans plus third party have a majority in three elections, the Democrats in three.

Table 2 shows that Republicans are strongest at the presidential level but have from 30% to 40% of the southern Congressmen and governors, but are weakest at the level on legislators in the State assemblies with only 15% that are Republican. This reflects the fact that Republican southern strength lags at the grass roots level.

In summary, in presidential politics, the South has gone Republican but while the former Nixon advisor and now columnist, Kevin Phillips, has argued in his book The Emerging Republican Majority (Arlington House, 1969) that the Nixon southern strategy assures a rising Republican party not only on the national level, but on the congressional and eventually state level—I am not at all sure that this last part of his prediction will prove to be correct. What I'm suggesting is that the style of the southern Congressmen and state leadership is changing in

both parties, but the Republican party may not be the beneficiary. To be specific, I would point to the defeat in the September 1972 Democratic primaries of Democratic Representative John Macmillan by Representative John Jenrette (New York Times, September 12, 1972, pp. 1 and 50). Here there was an interesting coalition in the Democratic Party of newer business groups, some labor and the black middle class which overturned an old line conservative Democrat, namely Macmillan. I would also point to the new type Democrat like William Gunter from Orlando (now in the U. S. House of Representatives), U. S. House member Sam Gibbons from Tampa, and from one of the Dade County districts, U. S. Congressman William Lehman. In other words, while the South is predominantly conservative and the Republican party is benefitting in presidential politics, there is both a new breed of Republicans developing, but also a new breed of Democrat. This new breed means some old line southern groups are being turned out by Republicans, but if Republicans like Florida's Governor Calude Kirk, don't deliver at the state level, they then are replaced by a new breed of Democrat like Governor Reubin Askew or U. S. Senator Lawton Chiles. This is also the type of change which is happening at the local government level. So while Nixon's strategy is rather effective in terms of presidential politics and is also effective in stimulating Republicans at the state and local political levels, I do not think it a foregone conclusion that there is a guaranteed Republican majority for congressional politics, state politics and for local politics. The type of coalitions which the South Carolina congressional race exemplifies is being reported elsewhere to provide a new breed Republican or a new breed

Democrat. At the local level I would point to the same type of development in politics in Atlanta where a series of mayors representing the new coalition are quite different from the old style southern politics.

One other political matter. What about the Wallace movement as symptomatic of the development of a third party in the South? This seems unlikely to happen. Even before the impairment of George Wallace's health after the assasination attempt, the development of a third party was unlikely. Now it is hard to forsee a third party development as a serious possibility.

In conclusion I would say that the urbanization of politics in the South means (1) racial integration and substantial acceptance of it, (2) a trend to Republicanism and conservatism in national presidential politics, but (3) at state government levels and also (4) local political levels there is a new breed of both Southern Republicans and Southern Democrats including a sharp rise in black office holders; support for structural change in governments at the state and local level, an urban outlook for Southern legislators, and an idea of energetic industrialization of the South but no longer at the expense of the black, and (5) there are the new issues of environmental quality and population control in the high income and dense population areas of the South. Thus, there are many and significant changes in the South. The urban politics of the South means a break with traditional patterns. New patterns are emerging and the rate of change is great.

Table 1.--Electoral Votes in Southern States

Elections of	Republican Electoral Vote Total	Democratic Electoral Vote Total	Third Party Electoral Vote Total
1952	50	113	0
1956	102	67	0
1960	50	98	8
1964	47	118	0
1968	54	55	45
1972	163	3	0
TOTAL	466	454	53

Table 2.--Percent Republican Officeholders at Differing Levels of Government, 1972

1)	48%	of all southern electors Republican in presidential elections 1952-1972
2)	34%	of southern U. S. House members Republican (1973)
3)	41%	of southern U. S. Senate members Republican (1973)
4)	35%	of southern Congressmen (U. S. House and U. S. Senate) Republican (1973)
5)	27%	southern governors Republican (1973)
6)	15%	of members of southern legislatures Republican (1972)

Politics in an Urbanizing South: Workshop

"Politics in the South has moved a long way since 1902 when a leading Democratic paper referred to a Southern Republican convention as 'mossbacks, revenue-doodles and bun-smellers'; or since 1924 when South Carolina's Senator Coleman L. Blease noted that Calvin Coolidge got 1100 votes in his state. 'I do not know where he got them,' Blease said. 'I was astonished to know that they were cast and shocked to know that they were counted.'"

Based on traditional Southern attitudes concerning politics, it is easy to assert that a new thrust has developed, particularly with the apparent rise of the Republican party. But it is not yet certain whether these changes are more apparent than real; if real, in what direction is politics in the South taking; and finally, how, if at all, has urbanization affected politics in the South?

At the heart of possible changes in Southern politics are two issues of such fundamental importance that considerable research and analysis are required before they can be fully understood: the loyalty of the South to the Democratic party, and the issue of race. The two issues are, of course, very much related, and have been since the Civil War.

Perhaps the historic importance of these two questions holds the key to their outcome in the latter third of the twentieth century. Current Republican strategies to win the affection, and the votes, of Southerners look remarkably similar to the "Southern Strategy" of President Rutherford B. Hayes. During the Reconstruction Period, Hayes and members of his administration felt that the conservative business

and political orientation of many Southerners could readily be channeled into votes for the Republican Party. Hayes failed in his efforts to corral Southern votes, as did every Republican President who attempted the same appeal prior to Dwight D. Eisenhower. It was the racial issue, the repression of Reconstruction, and the bitterness if left, and the political symbolism which the Republican Party evoked for white Southerners which contributed to the failure of the Republican Southern strategy. The Democratic Party, that peculiar alliance of contentious and contradictory elements, retained the votes of Southerners.

But the fact remains that since 1948 the South has not voted as a solid unit in any Presidential election. Even conceding that Republican gains in the region may be more a function of internal rifts in the Democratic party than the success of a new Southern strategy by the GOP, there is still the question of whether the Democratic party can regain, or even approach, the Southern solidarity it had in national elections. The question becomes increasingly salient as the population of the South increases and its balance-of-power position in the electoral college grows. Thus, perhaps the most significant issue for the Democratic party is not whether the South will move permanently towards a solid Republican vote as it did in the Presidential election of 1972; rather, the issue is whether the party can formulate a program and present Presidential candidates during the 1970's which will appeal to the South and yet retain the traditional centers of influence in the Northeast and West.

The role which blacks play in Southern politics will be a significant determinant of the partisan affiliation of the South.

Disenfranchised for so long, and too often merely the pawn of white power structures when participation in politics was possible, black Southerners, largely through the civil rights movement and efforts of the federal government, have in the past decade become far more active in political arenas. That the rates of participation and awareness of political issues among Southern blacks remain low is widely known. It can reasonably be expected, however, that as urbanization in the South develops (which will, in part, mean an increasingly urban Southern black population), their rate of participation and interest in politics will rise. Assuming that the partisan loyalty of Southern blacks remain with the Democratic party, is it an historical axiom that their increasing activism will drive Southern whites out of the Democratic and into the arms of the Republican party? Or, indeed, can racial issues be bridged, and accomodations reached, so that both white and black loyalties remain with the Democratic party?

A third issue that must be examined concerns possible changes in traditional Southern political attitudes and values as urbanization occurs. The spirit of agrarianism, with its counterpoint of populism, which in various forms has dominated Southern political life for so many years is increasingly being confronted by a host of urban and metropolitan problems. What new awareness, if any, is developing in the South in competition with urbanization? Reapportionment has made State Legislatures more responsive, numerically, to urbanizing areas. But the issue is really how deeply the needs of an urbanizing society have cut into the traditional political norms of Southerners. It may be, in fact, that there are southern cities where orientation remains

primarily rural-agrarian rather than urban. And yet the growth of a system of urban-oriented values and perceptions is essential in Southern political life if the tensions and problems brought about by rapid urbanization are to be satisfactorily resolved.

Related to this point is another crucial political issue that faces the South. How can it deal, politically, with the problems of urbanization? Granted that perceptions will change and the agrarian-rural spirit of Southern politics will become a thing of the past, there is still the question of whether Southern political institutions and structures are capable of dealing with urbanization. What happens, for example, when county government (traditionally strong in the South) finds itself overwhelmed by a rapidly developing metropolis? Can the present structures of Southern government deal successfully with urban growth on a wide scale? It may very well be that institutions capable of governing an agrarian society cannot adapt to the process of urbanization. Yet governmental forms in the South appear reasonably resilient, and it must also be remembered that it is in the South that three of the most significant experiments in metropolitan government are taking place: Nashville, Jacksonville-Duval County, and Miami-Dade. It is entirely possible that, given an awareness by Southern public officials that urbanization can be controlled and actually made beneficial, new institutional forms can be developed. Regionalism, in particular, may very well be looked upon as a significant way in which traditional governmental units and structures can reorganize themselves in such a way as to respond positively to the

requirements of urbanization. The question is, of course, whether the necessary steps can be taken while urbanization is still in relative infancy in the South, or whether power struggles and the inertia of traditionalism will so dominate political institutions and processes that whatever is accomplished will be too little and too late.

Environment and Energy Workshop

Concerned citizens are increasingly coming to realize that the time is at hand for us to analyze the relationships between energy, the environment, and urbanization. Moreover, since public officials have only just begun to think about such issues, this analysis must attempt to identify certain energy and environment related problems which should have high priority in the thinking of urban political leaders. Though it is generally agreed that environmental and energy crises are not strictly "urban" problems and that the ultimate solution to these concerns will undoubtedly have to come from national and even international action, it is nonetheless true that urban centers do suffer from special environmentally related ills that can be isolated and studied.

There are, of course, numerous problems in the energy field that demand immediate public attention. The world supply of coal, for example, is dwindling and the range of possible alternatives to this fuel is limited. Cities, with their heavy demands of power, desperately need to find new ways to supply and conserve fuels. Many officials view it as paradoxical that Florida, the "sunshine state," is not using the limitless energy of the sun to meet these demands. Indeed, quite the opposite is true; each year increasingly large sums of money are spent to discover ways to fight this energy source. The development of new and more powerful air-conditioning units is only one example of this phenomenon.

It is of no small importance that the increased power needs of the state, seen most clearly in its urban areas, are primarily the result of the population's changing life styles. Population increases in Florida have played a relatively small role in the vastly enlarged power consumption rates. Significantly, there is no evidence to indicate that this spiraling of power wants and demands will stabilize in the forseeable future. Increased energy consumption has already had a profound effect upon Florida's fragile environment and has produced an early crisis which will hopefully push us to find early solutions.

Perhaps the most vexing questions in the minds of concerned environmentalists are whether public officials are aware of this crisis, whether they are drafting well conceived measures to combat it, and whether these measures will be effective in dealing with these problems. Present opinion suggests that the answer to none of these queries is yes. Illustrative of the short-sightedness that has characterized reactions of public officials has been the policy formation following the recent spate of electrical black-outs. Public office holders have not been asking themselves how we can better use the supplies and facilities we have, but they have been busying themselves with plans to supply more energy by building more power plants. There are not solutions--they are simply half-measures that attack the symptoms of the problem and will ultimately be inadequate answers to the larger issues at hand.

Urban leaders, moreover, have often sponsored policies which have served to intensify the energy and environment crisis. The aggressive promotion of electrical use engaged in by many cities is an excellent

example. City utilities have frequently paid for advertising to aid developers who erect all-electric homes. Further, the present rate structures for many utilities encourage the heavy use of electricity. Arguments are only now being heeded which call for a reversal of this situation, with those persons using the most electricity paying the most for electrical production.

Consumption can be reduced by other means. Laws are presently being debated which will require all new trailer parks to have significant portions of their available space under shade. The effect of this ordinance is obvious. Additionally, several cities have adopted changes in their building codes to require more insulation in new homes and to prevent the building of windowless, black, un-insulated structures which necessitate heavy power outlays for air-conditioning.

Yet, environmentalists must realize that local government has to contend with many different constituencies, some of which are mutually antagonistic. Conflicting interest groups put great pressure upon public officials and often affect the outcomes of energy issues.

The problem of controlling energy also raises considerable opposition among the general population since control measures often infringe upon individualism. Freedom of the individual has been a cherished part of our American heritage. Can national, state, and local governments dictate to their citizens when and how to use and not use electricity? Similar questions apply to rationing of gasoline and other fuels. Should the government have the authority to tell people whether they can or can not travel to Colorado from New York and see the United States?

These are disturbing and important issues which critically need to be explored fully before irreversible decisions are made. It is hoped that discussions such as these can serve as first steps in the long period of investigation that ultimately will have to be made before workable solutions are found.

Economic Development Workshop

The workshop on economic development focused primarily on the problems of urban growth. In many, perhaps most, American cities citizens are less aware of growth than of decline and decay. But the two forces are by no means incompatable: growth in certain parts of the city's economic and social systems can mean serious difficulties for other sectors. Also, of course, urban growth is partly a regional phenomenon. While cities in the Northeastern United States are losing population, and while their economies are at best stable, cities in the South and Southwest are booming. Gainesville is one such thriving city; yet the rapid growth it is experiencing causes problems no less severe or baffling than those affecting cities which are failing.

Growth in Gainesville has been intense in the past decade. Between 1962 and 1970, the city has expanded by 34%; projected figures for the next decade suggest that a population of 150,000 will be reached by 1982. While the population of the city has doubled since 1960, however, the city budget has in the same period increased five-fold. Thus it is clear that population growth causes an even faster rate of growth in city government and services. There is a significant question, however, whether the tax base needed to support the rapid growth of the public sector has risen at the same rate.

Urban growth has a whole range of consequences, and it is essential that accurate measures be developed to assess their relative benefits and costs. Some of these can readily be determined. For

example, growth clearly implies increased services, more jobs, higher incomes. It also seems to mean waste of resources, pollution, noise, and traffic. But there are a host of intangibles which can affect both the economics of the city and its quality of life: personal attitudes, changes in consumption patterns and life styles, fragmentation (or integration) of the social order. Thus, while certain aspects of economic growth in Gainesville may be apparent, considerably more work has yet to be done on the less obvious, but no less important consequences of economic growth.

Economic development in Gainesville has been complicated by the presence of the University. Whenever a single agency dominates the economic structure of the community, as the University of Florida does here, a number of economic problems inevitably occur. These difficulties essentially involve the heavy dependence of the community on employment opportunities directly in, related to, or serving the University. The presence of a large, residential student body in the city compounds these difficulties. The expansion of the student body has aided in the growth of the city, of course, both in population and in its economy. But there are also drawbacks. What effect, for example, does a levelling off of the student population have on growth, especially for those parts of the economy which directly serve student needs? Even with a relatively constant enrollment there are other costs. For instance, local banking institutions lose some $125,000 per year on student checking accounts because there is no service charge. Students, too, are an integral part of the employment patterns in Gainesville,

and any change in the student population necessarily affects the availability of jobs.

The presence of a relatively undiversified economy, specifically a large white-collar work force, has caused serious concern among citizens and public officials in Gainesville. Questions have been raised about the desirability of bringing in new industry and seeking new service- and industrial-bases of employment. For example, should Gainesville capitalize on the "retirement industries" and "tourist industries" that have developed in Florida? The problem, of course, is what industries should be encouraged to come to Gainesville? Will employment openings, moreover, be given to local persons, as would be most desirable, or will additional outsiders be imported to fill the jobs? Recruitment of new industry raises several additional and potentially more disturbing problems. It encourages further growth at a time when some individuals and groups are beginning to ask whether growth ought to be halted or slowed. Furthermore, although new industry brings increased revenues to the area, it also greatly increases the burden of municipal services, thus compounding the fiscal dilemmas of the city. There is also the issue of new industry and its impact on the environment. Given the present concern it is clear that no decisions about future industrial development in the city, or about its total economic structure, can be made without full consideration of their consequences on the environment.

Although Gainesville is undergoing rapid urbanization, the rest of Alachua County remains predominately agricultural. This surrounding

area is heavily dependent on Gainesville, and it uses the hospital facilities, cultural services, roads and other amenities of the city without sharing in their cost. Indeed, the costs of this dependence far outweigh any benefits to Gainesville, and as a result the city's financial burden is substantially increased. Migration to the city from rural areas, both in Alachua County and elsewhere, is also occurring. In many cases employment opportunities for persons with agricultural skills are hard to obtain since the employment pattern in Gainesville is heavily white-collar. Moreover, the social service needs of this population only exacerbate the already strained capabilities of city programs. Proposals have been made recently, and undoubtedly will continue in the future, for consolidation of Gainesville with the surrounding area in an effort to spread the costs of growth more equitably. These efforts, so far, have foundered on the rocks of political infeasibility: surrounding areas do not wish to bear the burden of cost. It seems inevitable, however, that consolidation must occur if the area is to deal on a metropolitan, and presumably more effective and equitable, basis with its growth problems.

Surrounding all of these questions, and perhaps fundamental to all of them, are three issues of such importance that they underlie all urban economic concerns: how much city growth is desirable; what kind of growth is needed, if any; and how can growth be controlled? It may well be that there are limits to the optimum growth of a city. It may also be that, in terms of a city's needs, some kinds of growth are more appropriate than others. Thus priorities need to be determined and implemented as a matter of public policy.

Growth, of course, is an integral part of the American tradition of "bigger and better." Yet very recently it has become apparent to economists, environmentalists, population experts, and students of urban affairs that unlimited growth is no longer the blessing it was once seen to be. How big should the city become? Economists suggest that a city of 150,000-300,000 population may have maximum efficiency. Should Gainesville and other cities then stop their growth when they reach this size? The possibility of cities' embarking upon a no-growth or limited growth policy has recently been employed in a number of Florida cities, and undoubtedly will be considered in others. But who is to make the decisions regarding the slowing or halting of growth? And can these controls be implemented within our constitutional framework which places a premium on individual liberty and self-initiative?

The problem is complicated still further by the fact that some 70% of the fiscal decisions which affect Gainesville are not made in the city: they are made at the county, state, and national levels, and in corporate boardrooms located in other areas. Does Gainesville, or any other city, really have the capacity to determine its own economic destiny? At best, it appears this capability is severely circumscribed.

Finally, what do the citizens of the city want for themselves in terms of urban growth? Any possible growth-restraining policies would have to be an expression of popular will. But how can this popular will be ascertained with certainty? Referenda and city elections are possible sources of information, but available social science data suggest that the degree of public understanding on issues present in

elections is woefully low. Ultimately, however, if priorities are to be established and growth policies, of any kind, initiated and implemented, public discussion is essential. The question is, can this be done in such a way as to maximize both citizen participation and the soundness of the public policy?

Population and Human Resources Workshop

The state of Florida has experienced tremendous growth during the past thirteen years. Its population has more than doubled in this period from approximately two and a half million to over six million people. Furthermore, future projections anticipate a population of between thirteen and eighteen million people by the year 2000. If realized, this additional growth will increase the population density in the state from 265 persons per square mile to 610 per square mile by the end of the century. To cope with such population growth and such growth potential, Florida's lawmakers and planners have begun discussing seriously the possibility of limiting growth through lower density zoning and through population ceilings. Several cities, St. Petersburg to cite only one example, have already used zoning to limit growth. However, this approach has often generated urban sprawl which in some ways causes more serious problems than concentrated growth. The use of population ceilings is a relatively new planning device and has only been tried in the city of Boca Raton. Nevertheless, this method seems to be gaining considerable support from environmentalists and growth experts.

A ceiling limitation on population growth is not without its drawbacks, however. Because growth limitation places a limit on the number and types of jobs a community can provide, is there not a conflict between proposals to limit growth and the need for low income people to obtain employment and achieve mobility? It appears that

Florida's low income population, blacks, migrants, and poor whites will have difficulty finding adequate work unless steps are taken by the state to provide for their needs. Specifically, a good school system and a job training program will be essential to any program which seeks to uplift the poor in a no-growth area. Of additional importance will be programs to provide for adequate housing, health care, and a suitable environment for disadvantaged children. If a rigorously zoned society does not provide for these programs, it may well produce many of the same urban problems it is trying to avoid by curtailing growth.

Programs to help the poor are not only essential to planned no-growth areas but are also incumbent upon other established Southern and Florida urban areas. The gradual phasing out of the Housing and Urban Development programs by the Nixon administration has shifted the burden of assisting the poor to the state and local levels. Urban governments, with their large, low income populations, are faced with some crucial decisions during the next few years if they are to avoid the fragmentation and ultimate deterioration of their societies. Some governments are simply ignoring the problem by using revenue sharing funds to reduce taxes. Other more enlightened governments are pondering the difficult problem of how to improve the quality of life. There are a number of former HUD programs that cities can try to duplicate, such as public housing and urban renewal. Yet, neither of these approaches, nor the multitude of other antipoverty programs, is likely to succeed unless the total environment of the blighted area, and not simply isolated parts, are treated. This can only be successfully accomplished

by a determination and an understanding of the needs of low income people. The "traditional approach" of having white middle class administrators make the basic social service decisions for the poor has proven to be an abysmal failure. In addition, it has tended to further fragment the community. The poor see this as merely another attempt by the middle class to tell them the kind of life they should lead.

Cooperation by low income people is thus a vital element in any effort to upgrade urban society. But how does city government accurately ascertain the problems and desires of the poor? Disadvantaged people have a tradition of not voting and generally not taking an active part in community affairs. They often are reluctant to answer questionnaires or grant interviews. Indeed, they are suspicious of anything suggestive of "authority." Nevertheless, if the city genuinely wants a viable, healthy community, the political leaders must encourage involvement by the poor even if it means taking the government into the ghetto. In addition, the needs of low income people have to be studied sympathetically, by people who understand their problems and desires.

One of the greatest failures of urban renewal and public housing has been its destruction of community feeling. Renewal projects have traditionally leveled impoverished neighborhoods with little if any thought to their unity, integrity, or unique cultural advantages. The result has often been a more severely blighted area.

Florida faces an additional problem in providing services for its poor. The sunshine state has a large migrant population which works the agricultural lands and orange groves. Because of the low visibility of migrants they have often been ignored by the larger society.

However, the recent typhoid epidemic among transient workers in Miami pointed up only one of the many pressing needs they have. Migrants fulfill an important economic role in the state of Florida, yet they continually receive the worst housing and the fewest social services.

Thus Florida and the South must balance growth with a greater awareness and concern for its low income people. Cities in the Northeast that have failed to deal adequately with these problems have usually succumbed to the worst aspects of rapid growth and urbanization--slums, poverty, and general deterioration. For the South, failure to cope with these problems will produce similar urban ills. It will mean the loss of a valuable source of manpower and the decay of vital urban centers. The critical question is whether Southerners are any more willing to deal with these problems than the rest of the nation has been?

CONCLUSIONS

The enormously complicated array of problems which make up the fabric of urbanization prevent any easy summation. Indeed, in examining the collection of papers included in these proceedings, one must be struck by the seeming endlessness of problems which urbanization engenders. And yet, in fact, these papers have barely scratched the surface. This is in no way a reflection on the amount of thought and preparation that went into these efforts. It is, in part, a function of the original purpose of the Symposium, which was spelled out in the introduction.

More importantly, however, it is a reflection of our paucity of knowledge about urbanization. While scholars, citizens and public officials have in recent years spent a great deal of time, energy and money studying urbanization, and while millions of words have been written and spoken about it, the sad fact is that the art is still in its primitive stages. For example, there is still no fully agreed upon definition of urbanization. What it is, what it encompasses, and how its aspects are interrelated are still matters of dispute. It is highly likely, therefore, that political scientists, economists, sociologists, and historians, among other people, may actually be examining different phenomena under this single rubric.

If thus far efforts to agree on the substance of urbanization have met with limited success, the question might legitimately be raised, why another collection of writings about urbanization? Two reasons are appropriate. First, there is the need for additional information which

can add to what we do know about urbanization. Failure to agree on the nature of urbanization is a result of a lack of understanding, not a surfeit of knowledge. The second reason is contained in the papers themselves. The simple fact is that urbanization is occurring in the South, and in some places at a rate that can only be described as fearsome. Even so, as a number of papers point out, because urbanization is still in its reasonably early stages, at least in most of the South, there is, hopefully, a chance to prevent the excesses which have led to the frightful, inhumane conditions found all too often in the older urban centers of America. To do this, however, requires that immediate and intensive efforts be made to find out all the dimensions and ramifications of Southern urbanization. But, as the papers additionally point out, hardly anything has been done to determine what, if anything, is distinctive about Southern urbanization, and what it shares in common with urbanization elsewhere. This volume, and the Sympoisum itself, were intended to begin this very necessary research and discussion.

Much, of course, remains to be done. While it is undeniable that urbanization in the South is occurring, it is by no means clear precisely in what direction it is going. Hard as it is to fathom the immediate impact of urbanization on the economic, political, and social systems of the South, it is even more difficult to discern secondary and tertiary consequences. For example, does urbanization necessarily lead to a fragmented political structure in the urban area, with a large central city, rings of surrounding suburbs, and a host of overlapping (often redundant) special districts? Or are there conditions under which it can give rise to coordinated and integrated governmental

forms, perhaps on a metropolitan or even regional basis? What is the effect of urbanization on traditional practices in Southern race relations? Will urbanization in the South foster methods of planning for economic growth which are more effective than those elsewhere in the nation? Questions such as these must be explored if we are to understand the nature of urbanization in the South. But we are still in the process of defining and comprehending the fundamental issues and processes of urbanization which underlie even such basic matters as these.

Urbanization, wherever it occurs, very clearly has costs. Indeed, the papers in this volume dwell on the costs to such an extent that one might wonder if the South ought to seek, actively and vigorously, ways of preventing it. Unquestionably this would be an inappropriate response. It would probably be a futile and wasteful gesture at best. More importantly, however, there are very real benefits emanating from urbanization; the history of the city, while in part a tale of woe, is also the story of man's efforts to improve himself and his successes in doing so. The range of human experiences possible in a city and the richness which the city can add to man's existence are sufficient testaments to the benefits which can accrue from the development of urban centers.

The central problem facing us, however, is gaining control of the processes of urbanization. It must be made to enhance human values to work for us rather than against us as seems to have happened elsewhere. To do so requires that serious and concerted efforts be made to come to grips with the manifold problems of urbanization. It will require

an alliance, perhaps unprecedented in the South, among scholars, citizens, and public officials who, on an ongoing basis, can combine talents and energies to provide both knowledge and workable solutions. It will, at the very least, require a great deal of hard work.